

## RAILWAY TIME TABLES.

**Del. Lack & Western R. R.**  
Leave New York 10:45 A.M. 12:45 P.M.  
Arr. Newark 11:30 A.M. 1:30 P.M.  
Leave Newark 1:30 P.M. 3:30 P.M.  
Arr. New York 2:45 P.M. 4:45 P.M.  
**PROV. NEW YORK**  
Leave Newark 1:30 P.M. 3:30 P.M.  
Arr. New York 2:45 P.M. 4:45 P.M.  
Leave Newark 2:45 P.M. 4:45 P.M.  
Arr. New York 3:30 P.M. 5:30 P.M.  
**NEW YORK & GREENWICH LAKE RR.**  
Leave Chatham Hill 9:30 A.M. 7:30 P.M.  
Arr. Newark 10:45 A.M. 12:45 P.M.  
Leave Newark 1:30 P.M. 3:30 P.M.  
Arr. Chatham Hill 2:45 P.M. 4:45 P.M.  
**FROM NEW YORK**  
Leave Chambers Street 6:00 A.M. 8:00 A.M.  
12:00 M. 2:00 P.M. 4:00 P.M. 6:00 P.M.  
8:00 P.M. 10:00 P.M.  
Sunday 9:00 A.M. 11:00 A.M.

## NEWARK PASSENGER RAILWAY CO.

**RAILROAD TIME TABLE**  
Leave Newark 10:45 A.M. 12:45 P.M.  
Arr. Newark 1:30 P.M. 3:30 P.M.  
Leave Newark 2:45 P.M. 4:45 P.M.  
Arr. Newark 3:30 P.M. 5:30 P.M.  
**JOHN WORTHINGTON,**  
House Painter and Paperhanger  
474 BLOOMFIELD AVENUE,  
Opp. RAGH STREET.

## Transubstantiation Again.

*Mr. Editor:*

The statements recently made in THE CITIZEN in support of the Papal dogma of transubstantiation should have received an earlier attention, but for the pressure of other matters. That portion of those statements found in the attempted paraphrase of certain Scriptures held to teach that doctrine, together with some considerations upon its nature and consequences, shall include what we have only fully shown.

We would treat all men with consideration and respect. Their sentiments and acts we would handle according to their quality and worth, especially as affecting themselves and others.

With profession of charity, the author of the paraphrase we are now to examine, exhorts us to read the verses of Scripture which, as he asserts, contain the decisions in question and generously professes to act as our professor of plantation. Let us then see how and where he will bring us out. From the claims put forth, our expectation may be high; but it have no fall in the sequel!

We find at first that the alleged account of what led to this discourse of the Lord to those Jews, is crippled and insufficient. The occasion throws important light upon the whole matter which should not have been shut out. The connection is vital. Our professed explainer of this Scripture tells us that "faith will enable us to understand it." Understand it how? Plainly he means as teaching this, his pet dogma of transubstantiation. Faith is indeed a powerful instrument, but it is so only in the realm of the possible. It can work an impossibility. It does not create, but only sees and accepts what is. It believes that God is, but does not invent Him, or attempt to clothe Him with attributes he does not possess. Faith accepts truth and facts; but not falsehoods and absurdities. It may see beyond what human sense sees; but cannot see or accept, as true, what is contrary to human sense or to all the human senses. We cannot see through faith's eyes (for she is a seeing faculty) or accept with her hands what does not exist. If, therefore, this transmutation dogma does not exist in this Scripture, faith can neither see nor accept it as there, nor enable us to do, though gross superstition may. True Christian faith and rectified human sense alike and utterly reject what is contrary to and subversive of reason; but credulous and preposterous superstition bows down and worships it.

It is asked, did the Jews understand Him to speak of His own flesh? Most certainly they did. What other could they understand? They were not blind nor idiots. They had the evidence of their senses, and were weak and reckless enough to use it. Pie upon them for such impurity! But are we silly enough to differ from their judgment in this matter? We are not Gnostics, and agree with these Jews in this case. But does this favor this papist doctrinist? Not in the least. When it was affirmed that Christ did not "disbuse them," we ask, of what? Why, should he? Did he differ from them on the point? Did he not know that they had understood Him aright? He could not disabuse them of the truth of the fact. He never played at quibbling and deceptive games as some bearing His name have done. Nor was there a reason why he should. There was nothing here to set them right upon; all was right already. What call is there for this trivialous "No"? But we are told, that the language of our Saviour in this place is not figurative; and are treated to a rich presumption of what it would be, had it been so. Indeed! How does our friend know that it is not figurative or symbolic? Has he proved that it is not? Not in the least, unless, indeed, a jargon of uncouth words, quite innocent of truthful ideas be such proof. Has "the unanimous consent of the fathers" assured him that this language is to be taken literally and not symbolically? Far otherwise, as we shall see anon.

But even were it to be taken in a literal and not a symbolic sense, how does he know that it would be written in the barbarous manner he suggests? Who told him it would? Has he got a new revelation? Of whom—God or man? Spiders get their webs in a natural way; has he got his? Will he dictate to the Spirit of Inspiration what shall be the form of His Revelation? The reader is laughing at such "silliness" of utterance. Certainly, that is just what all who understand human speech and have seen this choice morsel of rhetoric are doing; for literal nonsense is apt to provoke mirth. No sir, your attempt at Scripture making or mending is a very lame caricature.

Let us go to the original text. "What is this? Spiders get their webs in a natural way; has he got his?" Will he dictate to the Spirit of Inspiration what shall be the form of His Revelation? The reader is laughing at such "silliness" of utterance. Certainly, that is just what all who understand human speech and have seen this choice morsel of rhetoric are doing; for literal nonsense is apt to provoke mirth. No sir, your attempt at Scripture making or mending is a very lame caricature.

But our good friend waits to know if Christ, when the Jews murmured, "explained Himself in a figure-like sense." He did not then, explain Himself in any sense. What explanation? His infinite wisdom judged fit and necessary for His present audience and all others to whom His Gospel should be preached, His reserved to the proper stage of His discourse. Our leader next paraphrases Christ's question and answer to these murmuring people: "Does it offend you? What then if ye behold the Son of man ascending up into heaven?" It is the spirit that quickens, the flesh profits nothing; the words I have spoken to you are spirit and are life." (Vis. 61.) His paraphrase does not explain, but simply wrests and perverts these words. It was not their seeing His flesh and blood, or mere humanity which Christ appealed to, as the reason why they should believe in Him, the true Messiah; but His peculiar Presence, as when He said to Philip, "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father;" and also His mighty works in their midst. These were the greatest sign that could be given them of His Messianship; and yet, not only did they disbelieve His faith, but stumbled at His teaching concerning Himself and their own salvation through His atoning blood. How much more, then, would they be offended at the mightier manifestation of His Messianic power and glory, which they should behold in His ascension. That it was so, subsequent history, as in the book of Paul, fully shows.

The notion that the Jews imagined Him to speak of His flesh as "dead flesh" in the meat market, which they were to eat, as cannibals devour their victims, is all puerile and futile. There is not a particle of evidence in the document, that any such thought was in their minds. It is moreover, however, of the circumstances touching both Him and them, wholly irrational and preposterous. The people evidently had no intelligent or definite idea how they were to eat the Lord's flesh or drink His blood, but in their contention among themselves simply asked "How?"

But our fruitful explainer will not only dictate manner, as that it would be written figurative flesh and blood, but he also undertakes to write Scripture to suit his purpose. Where, as stated in his paraphrase, does he find the Lord saying or hinting even—"When I shall hide my flesh and blood under the appearance of bread and wine"? This is a bold daring, and evidently made in the interest of his sectarian superstition. But this new patch agrees not with the old enduring garment; this new wine will not stay in the old bottle-explosion is the necessity. What the drinking of His blood, is as necessary to eternal life, as the eating of His flesh. And yet, not the laity, but only the priests are allowed the cup or wine! Does Rome believe this chapter intends the sacrament, and yet so deprive her masses?

But why has our worthy friend winked out of sight our statement, that several of his doctors and cardinals admit that this sacrament is not taught in the 8th chapter? Did he not like their company, or fear their admission? Did he ever read of a house divided against itself, and of the effect? Their names may well checkmate the wild extravagance of some others, in their attempt to thrust transubstantiation into these words of Christ.

*W. F. Sturtevant.*

## The Pilgrim and the Slave.

Rev. F. M. Shantz, Pastor United Brethren Church, Blue Mountain, Kan., says it is my duty to tell what wonders Dr. King's New Discovery has done for me. My lungs were badly diseased, and I thought my thoughts could live only a few weeks. I took five bottles of Dr. King's New Discovery, and am sound and well again, in weight, and strength. Arthur Lovell, Minister of St. Paul's Anglican Church, writes: "After a thorough trial and convincing evidence, I am confident Dr. King's New Discovery for Consumption, beats all, and cures every case of consumption." The greatest kindness I can do my many patients is to urge them to try it." Free sample to any Drug Store.

*REGULAR SIZE \$5.00 and \$10.00.*

## THE SUN

*FOR 1891.*

Some people agree with THE SUN's opinions about men and things, and some people don't; but we hope to get hold of the newspaper which is never still and never afraid to speak its mind.

Democrats know that for twenty years THE SUN has been in the front line for Democratic principles, never wavering in its loyalty to the true interests of the party. It serves with fearless intelligence and disinterestedness to them, through the incarnation word, from which should flow to them all the treasures of life, giving wisdom and knowledge.

Eight hundred and ninety-one will be a great year in American politics, and everybody should read THE SUN.

Daily, per month, \$0.50  
Daily, per year, \$6.00  
Daily and Sunday, per year, \$2.00  
Daily, per month, \$0.75  
Weekly Sun, one year, \$1.00

*Address THE SUN, New York.**SHERIFF'S NOTICE*

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the Sheriff, of New Jersey, between the 1st and 10th instant, will be at the Sheriff's Office, Newark, for the sale or mortgaged properties, to be sold by public auction, at the Courthouse, Newark, at two o'clock P.M., on the 10th instant, of land and premises situated in the town of Essex, in the state of New Jersey.

*For further information, see Sheriff's Notice.**NEWARK, N. J., December 15, 1890.**JACOB HAUSSLING, Sheriff.**FREDERICK G. BURBANK, Collector.**ST. JOHN'S, NEW JERSEY.**ST. JOHN'S, NEW JERSEY.*</